

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended, and in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-5, 7-11, 20, 21, 24 and 29 are active in this application, Claims 3-5, 7, 8, 11, 20, 21 and 24 having been amended, Claims 1, 2, 6, 12-19, 22, 23 and 25-28 canceled, and new Claim 29 added by the present Amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Davenport (U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2002/0082044); Claims 17-19 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davenport in view of Bosch (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,601); Claims 25-28 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davenport in view of Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,578); and Claims 3-5, 8, 11, 20, 21 and 24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter. In light of this indication, and to expedite early issuance of a patent from the present application, Claims 3-5, 8, 11, 20-21 and 24 have been rewritten to be in independent form and the rejected original claims, with the exception of Claim 7, have been cancelled. Accordingly, Claims 3-5, 8, 9-11, 20, 21, and 24 are believed to be in condition for formal allowance.

Also submitted herewith for examination is new claim 29 which recites the features of the controller as recited in paragraphs (e) and (f) of allowable Claim 8. Specifically, new Claim 29 recites that the controller determines if it is possible to additionally define said newly requested signal processing function to said resource by comparing the residual resource amount with the resource amount necessary for defining, to the resource, the newly

required signal processing function of the resource, and executes an additional definition when it is determined that the additional definition can be done. These features are believed to be patentably distinguishing over Davenport, which does not disclose such features. Therefore, Applicants believe that new Claim 29 also defines allowable subject matter. Claim 7, which has been amended to depend from Claim 29, is thus also believed to define allowable subject matter.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above comments, no further issues are believed to be outstanding, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\EHK\AMEND-RESPONSES\0039\21s\218429US-AM1.DOC